SPECIAL
COLLECTIONS
DOUGLAS
LIBRARY

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA

AN

# ANSWER.

TO

THREE SCURRILOUS PAMPHLETS,

ENTITLED

# THE JOCKEY CLUB.

BY A MEMBER OF THE JOCKEY CLUB.

*Qui ea quæ vult dicit, ea quæ non vult, audiet.*

TERENCE.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. S. JORDAN, No. 166, FLEET-STREET,

AC911. 1798 .M45

TO THE

MEMBERS OF THE CLUBS

IN ST. JAMES'S-STREET

AND

PALL-MALL,

THIS ANSWER

TO THE

SCURRILOUS PAMPHLETS,

CALLED

THE JOCKEY CLUB,

IS MOST

RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED

BY AN

*OLD FRIEND.*

# CONTENTS.


THE Author — *Page* 9
The King — 15
The Queen — 21
Prince of Wales — 28
Duke of York — 34
Duke of Clarence — 35
Duke of Glouceſter — 35
Ducheſs of Glouceſter — 36
Ducheſs of Cumberland — 36
Mrs. Fitzherbert — 38
Duke of Brunſwick — 40
Duke of Bedford — 41
Duke of Dorſet — 42
Duke of Grafton — 43
Duke of Leeds — 44
Duke of Montroſe — 45
Duke of Malborough — 45
Duke of Norfolk — 46
Duke of Portland — 48


Duke

CONTENTS.


Duke of Queenſberry ——— 49
Duke of Richmond ——— 50
Marquis of Lanſdowne —— 57
Earl of Barrymore — — 60
Earl Clermont ——— 60
Earl of Cheſterfield ——— 60
Earl of Coventry ——— ——— 61
Earl of Chatham ——— ——— 63
Earl of Derby ——— 65
Earl of Egremont ——— 66
Earl Groſvenor ——— 67
Earl of Harrington ——— 67
Earl of Leiceſter ——— 67
Earl of Upper Oſſory ——— 68
Lord Viſcount Stormont —— —— 69
Lord Auckland ——— 70
Lord Foley ——— 72
Lord Grenville —— 73
Lord Hawkeſbury ——— 74
Lord Kenyon ——— 76
Lord Onſlow ——— 77
Lord Thurlow ——— 78
Lord Belgrave ——— 81
Lord Gower ——— ——— 81
Lord Edward Bentinck ——— 81
Lord Geo. H. Cavendiſh —— 81
Lord John Townſhend ——— —— 81
Mr. Juſtice Buller, and the Doctrine of Libels 82
Mr. Edm. Burke, and the Reform of Parliament 93
Mr. Pitt ——— ———

AN

# ANSWER,

*&c. &c.*

## THE AUTHOR.

THERE can be no doubt that the Reader will readily and candidly admit, the Author of the Jockey Club is intitled to pre-eminence of ſituation in this Anſwer to his books. He has a claim, by the provocation he has given, to ſtand at the head of the liſt. He who has ſo largely libelled others, by the moſt unpardonable falſehoods, muſt expect a diſplay of his own character. But contrary to the example he has offered, he ſhall not be

pourtrayed in falſe colours, nor in language unfounded in truth. He ſhall be repreſented exactly as he is,

> Nothing extenuate,
> Nor ſet down aught in malice.

He ſhall be exhibited in terms of the ſtricteſt truth. He who ſays what he pleaſes, ſhall hear what he does not like.

---

*There are whom Heaven has bleſs'd with ſtore of wit,*
*Yet want as much again to manage it.* POPE.

There is no character to whom this motto could be more properly applied. It was ſaid of Sixteen-String-Jack, and other notorious characters of the ſame ſtamp, that they were only half made; or, as Shakeſpear ſays, "they were made by one of Nature's jour-"neymen, that had not been an hour at the "trade:" That is, in the Shandean deſcription, the clock had not been wound up, the weights had not their proper draught, nor the wheels their full velocity; ſo the homunculus was not electrified but affected, not at the birth, but at the origin. This is the beſt apology that can be made for a non-deſcript animal

mal of the human form. Poſſeſſed of ſenſe without diſcretion, of learning without improvement, of language without veracity—ſuch a man may be as deſtitute of any good quality, as amply endowed with every bad one. Agreeable to this idea, Pope altered his diſtich, ſome years afterwards, thus:

*There are whom Heaven in wrath has been profuſe,*
*Yet want as much to turn it to its uſe.*

This caſe has been exemplified, in the ſuperlative degree, in a man, whoſe talents are not contemptible, but whoſe principles are deteſtable; who never ſpeaks three words, but two of them are falſe; who never receives a favour, but he ungratefully abuſes the donor; who never makes a promiſe, but with an intention to deceive; who never makes an engagement, but with a deſign to break it; who has betrayed every confidence with which he has been entruſted; who has robbed his friends, cheated his creditors, repudiated his wife*, and libelled all his acquaintance.

He received his education at Eton, where, from his particular neatneſs and attention to

* Mr. Jekyll can give the beſt account of this tranſaction.

the furniture of his head, he was known by the happy appellation of *Louſe*; and at Cambridge, the beauty of a ſallow face, enriched with variegated pimples, gained him the additional name of the *Ripe Whitlow*.

Thus diſtinguiſhed he came to Newmarket; and ſoon made himſelf as conſpicuous by the purity of his principles, as the elegance of his perſon. On the turf his confederates could not truſt him; and at the hazard-table he never truſted fortune. He practiſed every manœuvre, and ſnatched at all advantages. When he won, he was rude and preſſing to receive—when he loſt, he always diſputed the debt, and never paid but upon compulſion: For it is upon record, that the law, diſqualifying defaulters from ſtarting horſes until the payment of former ſtakes, had its origin from his tardineſs. Unable to keep his ground on the courſe, he fled to France; and being enamoured of a lady at Paris, he made propoſals to her, and purchaſed the poſſeſſion of her charms with a forged draft *; then left her to think on what had paſt, and ſigh alone.

* Lord Barrymore can explain this.

A fo-

A foreign climate no longer ſuiting our hero, he repaired to London; and reſided, occaſionally, at his creditors pleaſure, in Newgate, in the Fleet, and in the King's Bench. His conſtant occupation in theſe retirements, was to write begging letters to the members of the Jockey Club, and in the moſt humilitating ſtyle to ſupplicate their bounty.

Mr. Charles Fox, who is perhaps one of the beſt-natured men in the world, made known his ſituation to the Jockey Club at Newmarket, and recommended, with his irreſiſtible force, an immediate relief. The ſilver plate went round, and two hundred and thirty guineas were collected, and ſent to him in the King's Bench Priſon: And other applications were repeatedly ſucceſsful. For all which, his gratitude has diſplayed itſelf in a general libel on the whole ſociety.

Copies of theſe libels he has occaſionally ſent to ſeveral ladies; ſome of whom have deprecated his menaces, with preſents of Bank paper. Thus, by the ſale of his libels, and the purchaſe of his ſilence, he boaſts that he has levied on the Public upwards of five

thouſand

thouſand pounds. This is his laſt act; and if the affair of the draft had been wanting, it is ſufficient to ſet the ſeal to his character.

In a word, he has lived in a regular violation of the laws of juſtice, honeſty, friendſhip, gratitude, and every moral obligation. He is deteſted where he is not deſpiſed; and ſhould the ſecond ſigning of a name, not his own, conſign him to the fate he has once eſcaped and long deſerved, the only regret would be, that a life of ſuch profligacy had not ſooner ended in a death of ignominy.

*Trahit ſua quemque voluptas.*

Say, why does —— bear the Louſe's name?
His habits and his practice are the ſame.
The natural Louſe, by powerful inſtinct led,
Finds peace and plenty in the ſchool-boy's head.
Louſe —— follows the ſame occupation,
Lives on the heads of folks in higher ſtation,
Heads of the Jockey Club, and of the nation*.

* Morning Poſt, May 7, 1792.

THE

## THE KING.

NOT one of the preſent ſovereigns of Europe has been treated by their ſubjects with ſo much rudeneſs as his Majeſty of Great-Britain. Nobody can ſay that the people of theſe iſlands do not enjoy liberty, when ſuch pamphlets as the Jockey Club can be daily publiſhed with impunity. But it is not in the pens of Wilkes, Junius, or the writer of the Jockey Club, to injure his Majeſty's benign and benevolent character. It is not by the praiſe, or the ſlander, of ſuch men, that a character, ſo tranſcendent in virtue, ſo free from every kind of vice, can in any degree be affected.

Whatever Lord Bute's defects in politics may have been, he certainly inſtilled into his royal pupil the pureſt notions of virtue and religion. Lord Bute is now dead; therefore this ſmall tribute of juſtice to his memory cannot be called intereſted. No perſon has ever performed the duties of a father and a huſband, with more exactneſs and punctuality,

ality, than his Majeſty. In private life there are very few who are his equal. Theſe are notorious truths, which every man in the kingdom knows, and therefore they need not be dwelt upon.

With reſpect to his Majeſty's public character, or the exerciſe of his functions as a ſovereign, the law has given him no character. The law ſays, in *totidem verbis*, "that the king can do no wrong." He is not reſponſible in the exerciſe of his regal powers. For the law has very wiſely ſtated and eſtabliſhed, that every act of the Crown ſhall originate in the advice of ſome one or more of its miniſters; and in order to fix this obligation as ſtrong as poſſible, the law has further declared (ſee the Act of Settlement) that whatever advice is given to the king, ſhall be ſigned by the perſon who gives it.

When the late Lord Chatham adviſed his Majeſty to recall Lord Briſtol from Madrid, he ſigned the advice he gave. His Lordſhip deſcribes it himſelf in theſe words: "Lord Temple and I ſubmitted in writing, and *ſigned by us*, our moſt humble ſentiments to his Majeſty &c." If this advice had been adopted,

and bad conſequences had followed from it, Lord Chatham and Lord Temple would have been reſponſible; no imputation of error, or deſign, could have been laid to his Majeſty.

If the meaſures or politics of the preſent reign have been improvident, and candour muſt admit that they have been greatly ſo, the blame is not to be aſcribed to the King. Even the affair of America, which the author of the Jockey Club would attribute to the royal interference, can have no foundation in truth; becauſe that war could neither have been begun, nor the meaſures of its progreſs have been purſued, without the *original advice* of ſome privy counſellor. The meaſure could not come *firſt* from the King. Can there be a doubt that if the minute-book of the ſeveral councils held upon this great ſubject was examined, that we ſhould find the names of North, Sandwich, &c. &c. ſigned to all the advice they gave? And is it in the leaſt degree probable, that ſuch men would execute any meaſures they had not adviſed? The man who ſuppoſes it muſt ſtig-

matize their memories with the foulest charge of baseness, as well as meanness.

This law of making ministers responsible, is coëval with our constitution. It is a mistake in whoever supposes it to have been first made at the Revolution: For amongst the many instances which might be produced, we shall take only one—when the House of Commons, in the reign of Charles the First, before the civil war broke out, presented an address to his Majesty on the subject of grievances, the King gave an answer that proved very disagreeable to the Commons; upon which the Commons immediately presented another address to the King, beseeching his Majesty to inform them *who advised him to give that answer.* Thus we see, that the House of Commons, in those days, did not hold the King answerable for even his own words. This responsibility of ministers was regulated at the Revolution. As the law and the constitution now stand, explained and ascertained, nothing can be more clear, than that the King is entirely emancipated from all possibility of imputation on the score of public measures.

To

To add further argument on this ſubject, would be an idle waſte of time and words. Every man of the plaineſt underſtanding muſt ſee, and be convinced of the entire excluſion of the King from all reſponſibility reſpecting the meaſures of government. And therefore, whatever bad policy they may originate in, or whatever bad conſequences may attend them, the King cannot be included in the conſideration or arraignment of them.

When we ſee, therefore, Wilkes, Junius, the author of the Jockey Club, or any other ſcribbler, aſcribing to the King the blame of thoſe meaſures which conſtitutionally belongs to his miniſters, it indiſputably appears, that all ſuch writers, ſo far from being friends to the Conſtitution, which they pretend, are directly the reverſe; becauſe they make a charge, which, if it were juſt, would overturn the Conſtitution. If the King could exerciſe any power in the formation of meaſures, the reſponſibility would belong to him, and not to the miniſters. Either way, therefore, theſe writers are guilty of the moſt palpable libels—on the King, or on the Conſtitution.

The writer of the Jockey Club goes greatly out of his way to give an account of the proceedings of the French at Paris. Theſe occurrences have no concern with the King of Great Britain. He has taken no part in the diſpute between the French and their King. The writer might, with the ſame propriety, have introduced an account of the affairs of Poland, or of China. The character of the Britiſh Sovereign is not repreſented by a narrative of events in Paris; events which bear no analogy, either in their motives or conſequences, to the ſtate of Great Britain. But it ſerves to ſhew the writer's hatred to Kings in general, and to all monarchical government; that he is of the levelling principle, and is an enemy to Kings throughout, becauſe he has not the opportunity of becoming a deſpot himſelf; for there is not one of theſe furious democrats who is not a tyrant at heart. If he had power, he would rule with a more abſolute and arbitrary ſway than any King whatever. A democratical government is the moſt arbitrary government upon earth; witneſs that of our neighbours the Dutch, whoſe very proviſions are exciſed. Theſe pretended friends of liberty and equality are, in their hearts,

hearts, the greateſt tyrants. Where they have power, they are the moſt ſevere taſk-maſters. If, in the days of monarchy, ſuch atrocities had been committed as have lately diſgraced Paris, and other cities in France, not, perhaps, by the authority of government, but at leaſt by its connivance or permiſſion, all Europe would have reſounded with complaints of the ſhocking abuſe of monarchical power. But, at preſent, all democrats ſpeak of theſe atrocities with the greateſt indifference, as trifling circumſtances of the day, not deſerving of a moment's reflection.

---

## THE QUEEN.

Be thou as chaſte as ice, as pure as ſnow,
Thou ſhall not eſcape calumny.

IF this amiable and adored Princeſs had eſcaped the malignancy and ſlander of the author of the Jockey Club, it would have been more than a miracle. He who has libelled ſo much private worth and public virtue, could not, in the general catalogue, omit her Majeſty.

jeſty. It would have been as impoſſible to have been guilty of it, as to have omitted the mention of the moon in the general deſcription of a fine night. But it is here, as well as in other places, that the writer fails in his deſign, and his ſatire recoils upon himſelf.

Her Majeſty's preciſion, in the duties of a wife and mother, are beyond the reach of even ſuſpicion. What, then, is ſhe to be condemned for?—Why, for *œconomy!*

Let every mother in our iſland lay her hand upon her heart, and declare, if ſhe thinks any mother ought to be condemned for œconomy, who has had ſo many *daughters?*

The private life of her Majeſty admits of no reproof. Therefore, this ſpecies of conduct, which, properly ſpeaking, is no public concern (for if her Majeſty's conduct and management were quite otherwiſe, it would neither increaſe nor diminiſh the civil liſt, becauſe her Majeſty has only a fixed allowance out of that fund), is held up as a matter of criminal import. What pity it is that they cannot produce an act of parliament againſt œconomy!

nomy! But, in the words of Shakeſpear,

True, a pity it is, and pity it is 'tis true,

that this example of œconomy, in the higheſt ſituation from whence example ſhould be ſhewn, has not had a better effect. Examples of virtue and moral rectitude, particularly and moſt eſpecially in a Queen, who has been the mother of many fine children, ought to have the moſt powerful and ſtrongeſt force. The higher the rank, the more obſervant and the more exemplary the conduct ought to be, particularly in the line of virtue and domeſtic œconomy. This her Majeſty has ſhewn in the fulleſt extent.

Happy would it be for many families in gay and ſplendid life, if their illuſtrious example were better followed. We ſhould not ſee ſo many proſecutions in Doctors Commons; ſo many ſolicitors for penſions and ſinecure places; ſo many bankruptcies among our merchants and traders; ſo many unfortunate dupes of credulity in our priſons; ſo many of our manufacturers ſtruggling between land and water, as it were, for a bare ſubſiſtence, owing to their loſſes among thoſe who are uſually deno-

denominated great people, or people of faſhion. If theſe, in their houſehold expences and domeſtic arrangements, imitated her Majeſty, their creditors would be diminiſhed in number, and their importance advanced in celebrity.

The charge which the author of the Jockey Club endeavours to fix upon her Majeſty, turns upon himſelf. He therein exhibits the profligacy of his own character; for he is not only willing to ſhew all diſregard to private character himſelf, but he wiſhes to deſtroy it in others.

In political affairs, neither the tongue nor the pen of ſlander have ever accuſed her Majeſty of the leaſt interference in thoſe matters; not even in the patronage of places; for what political ſervant has ſhe ever appointed? or what man has ſhe ever influenced on any political queſtion whatever? In this light her Majeſty ſtands clear of all imputation.

Other Queens have been charged with ſelling of titles, places, and reverſions; and ſtrong facts have been urged in ſupport of the charges.

Wagers of large ſums, it has been ſaid, have been occaſionally laid on the advancement of certain gentlemen to the peerage, and on the appointments of certain perſons to particular ſituations.

In a late reign theſe practices were common; and ſome queens, as well as ſome miſtreſſes, have amaſſed large private fortunes by them. But her preſent Majeſty has never been ſuſpected of ſuch corrupt and intereſted practices. She has made no connections with any of the public offices; the perſons in them are as much ſtrangers to her Majeſty's perſon, as the inhabitants of the moſt diſtant county.

As, therefore, nothing could be ſaid that had any foundation in truth, againſt her preſent Majeſty, the author of the Jockey Club reſorts to fiction. Some of his admirers ſay that he writes in a very flowery and poetic ſtyle. It is a literary proverb, that fiction ſhines beſt in that ſtyle. He ſays, ſhe fills a rank that her birth gave her no right to expect. This is not true: For no longer ago than in the laſt century, the Houſe of Mecklenburgh was as reſpectable as the Houſe of Hanover; and might have been

ſo at this day, if the Houſe of Hanover had not been called to the throne of Great Britain. But this Princeſs was choſen for her merit: Her anceſtry made no part of the conſideration.

It is eaſy to ſee, that a writer muſt be greatly diſtreſſed for calumny, who makes the ornaments of female attire the ſubject of ſlander.

Her Majeſty's *diamonds!*—Theſe are the ſubject.—The Queen is not the firſt lady who has ornamented a full dreſs with diamonds. Every other lady would do the ſame if ſhe could. The habit of the Queen is not a matter of public concern; nor is it a queſtion affecting any public intereſt, whether her Majeſty's habit is ornamented with *diamonds*, or with gold and ſilver fringe.—But *diamonds* have for ſome time been a theme in certain newſpapers; and therefore the author of the Jockey Club, having no better ſubject, purſues this vulgar theſis. Vulgar the ſubject may be truly denominated, becauſe only vulgar or miſled perſons could ever ſuppoſe the matter or thing a proper object for calumny. And it is ſurpriſing that any perſon, who pretends to have

have ever been a member of the Jockey Club, could deſcend to ſo ungentlemanlike a ſpecies of reproach; ſeeing that all men alike, from the higheſt to the loweſt, warmly admire the advantageous appearance of the female part of their families.

## THE PRINCE OF WALES.

IF the Stuart line had not been completely extinct, every reader of the Jockey Club muſt have been perſuaded that the writer of that work was as zealous and fierce a Jacobite as any of the rebels who were executed in the years 1715 and 1745; for he ſpares none of the line of Brunſwick, either immediate or remote from the throne; he lays about him indiſcriminately.

His Royal Highneſs, whoſe heart is ever open, and whoſe hand is ever ready to relieve diſtreſs, ſhares, with his friends, the effuſions and effects of this writer's ingratitude. Thoſe who have adminiſtered to his neceſſities are among the foremoſt of thoſe whom he has moſt calumniated. His ſelections for obloquy are made by the rule, or rather the extent of his obligations. Thoſe who have been his beſt friends, and who have contributed liberally to his wants, are thoſe whom he reviles firſt, and moſt. As there are degrees in ingratitude, as well as in other vices, ſo this may be called the ſuperlative degree of that depravity. His

Royal

Royal Highneſs's character, like all other great characters, may be expreſſively given in a few words:

Plain truth—needs no flow'rs of ſpeech.

In plain words, then, this Prince is the firſt of his houſe who has had a moſt excellent and claſſical education. When, upon a well-known miſunderſtanding, Lord Bruce, now Lord Ayleſbury, was appointed preceptor to his Royal Highneſs, his Lordſhip found the Prince a better claſſic than himſelf; and in the other qualifications of the well-bred gentleman, ſo much ſuperior to all the young people of faſhion, as of any expectation he could have formed, that he almoſt immediately found himſelf ſo inadequate to the perfection, or even continuation, of his Royal Highneſs's education, that he waited upon the King, in a few days after his appointment, and implored his Majeſty's clemency to permit him to reſign his place of preceptor; becauſe, as he confeſſed, his Royal Highneſs's education was far ſuperior to his own. This was in the year 1776: Since which, his Royal Highneſs has wonderfully improved in all the elegant accompliſhments of the complete gentleman. To ſoften Lord Bruce's fall, he was created Earl of Ayleſbury. His

His Royal Highneſs is alſo the firſt Prince of his houſe who has ſeen the people of this kingdom. He has converſed with them—aſſociated with them—lived with them at their houſes. They have converſed and aſſociated with him. The intercourſe has been mutual and frequent. He has thus acquired a real and true knowledge of the people. This moſt intereſting of all information he has acquired by perſonal acquaintance and experience; by ocular conviction. Theſe are advantages which no Prince of the Houſe of Brunſwick had ever obtained. They knew not our language; and beſides, there is, amongſt the Germans in general, a ſort of feudal hauteur, which does not ſuit with our natural and good-humoured familiarity. This neceſſary diſtinction his Royal Highneſs has happily made.

Theſe are prominent traits of his character, which the preſent age have ſeen with inexpreſſible pleaſure, and revere with the enthuſiaſm of veneration. The nation conſiders them the fortunate preſage of a glorious reign.

The

The writer of the Jockey Club, who muſt have ſome topic for his ſlander, arraigns his Royal Highneſs's ſocialities. He conceives that his Royal Highneſs is there vulnerable; or at leaſt that he ſhall thereby attach ſome part of the public attention, by holding out a private conſideration, with a view to forget a public one. It muſt be confeſſed, that this peculiar kind of abuſe operates both ways, as well on the party who accepts of ſuch aſſociates, as on thoſe who are accepted. But in this diſtinction of the perſons who are ſo highly honoured by his Royal Highneſs, there is a qualification annexed, which no rank or fortune can give; this is their mental capacity, or, in other words, their brilliant talents, ſound ſenſe, and extraordinary underſtanding. When we ſee a Prince, the heir apparent of the Britiſh throne, ſelecting for his convivial hours ſuch men as Mr. Fox, Mr. Sheridan, Captain Payne, &c. &c. who does not ſay that he makes a moſt judicious choice? If he were to chuſe ſome of our young gentlemen of faſhion for his occaſional aſſociates, who would not lament his want of penetration, and feel an intereſt in his want of diſcernment

cernment to diſtinguiſh the man of parts from the man of pride? By the choice he has made, even his hours of conviviality contribute to the improvement of his mind. He can be in no danger of imbibing erroneous principles of politics, or miſconceptions of our conſtitution, from men of ſuch enlarged and liberal underſtanding as Mr. Fox and Mr. Sheridan.—Happy would it have been for mankind, if every prince in Europe had finiſhed his education under men of equal ability, philanthropy, and integrity.

A Prince of ſuch expectations, and ſuch endowments, has no parallel in hiſtory for moderation. When every incitement to ambition and glory offered itſelf ſpontaneouſly—in a moment of public exigence, he more than heſitated—he ſubmitted to a participation of the diadem—taking the whole of the reſponſibility, and only ſharing the power with another. This complacency of his conduct will be the theme of admiration in all poſterity. The author of the Jockey Club inſinuates ſomething of the conduct of the Queen in this matter. She might act from her feelings as a wife

and

and a mother. But the generoſity of the Prince tranſcends all comment. Rather than wound the feelings of his mother, or diſappoint the hopes of the nation, who had their firſt claim upon him, he conſented to accept a mutilated government, under the moſt alarming circumſtances, and popular apprehenſions. In the conſideration of this ever-memorable circumſtance, there will always be found, not only an unexampled generoſity and philanthropy in the Prince, but a moſt dutiful reſpect to the Queen his mother, cemented by an anxious ſolicitude for the intereſts and happineſs of the country. Such inſtances of true patriotiſm are not often ſeen amongſt princes. Nor are princes, of ſuch pure and ſincere regard for the people, often ſeen in courts. That his Royal Highneſs is one of theſe rare inſtances, is well known to thoſe who have had the honour of viewing his character.

Of this Prince there is only one thing wanting, and that is, a better acquaintance with his natural diſpoſition.

A more humane heart in private life, a more accompliſhed gentleman in public rank,

a more ſincere friend to his country, or one better informed of the character and diſpoſition of the people, and of the principles and ſpirit of the conſtitution, is not to be found among all the young gentlemen of the preſent age.

This is not ſpoken of him as a Prince, to whom the venal are always ready to offer adulation, but as a private gentleman, by one who has obſerved his conduct for ſeveral years.

*Hæc tibi erunt artes* ———
*Parcere ſubjectis, et debellare ſuperbos.* VIRG.

---

## THE DUKE OF YORK.

HIS Royal Highneſs's military character is without impeachment. His private character requires no elucidation. *Opinionum commenta delet dies, naturæ judicia confirmat.* CIC.

DUKE

## DUKE OF CLARENCE.

—COME thou goddeſs, fair and free,
In heaven yclep'd Euphroſyne . . . . .
And if I give thee honour due,
Mirth, admit me of thy crew;
To live with her and live with thee,
In unreproved pleaſures free. MILTON.

## DUKE OF GLOUCESTER.

*Non eſt vivere, ſed valere, vita.* MART.

THIS Prince might have been ſpared in the Jockey Club. The ſtate of his Royal Highneſs's health, and bodily infirmities, are well known. The introduction of him, therefore, among the heroes of the turf, was a ſort of ſavage barbarity. It can be accounted for only by ſuppoſing, that the writer had taken a reſolution to libel the whole family; and he ſeems to have done it with uncommon malignity, as well as acrimony. However, what he ſays of this Prince merits no attention.

## DUCHESS OF GLOUCESTER.

*Fœminis prælata.*

IT might be aſked, what relation does her Royal Highneſs bear to the Jockey Club, that entitles her to a place in it? The anſwer would be, *None.* Yet it ſerves the writer's purpoſe; having given a niche in his Belvedere to the Duke, he muſt give another to the Ducheſs. It makes food for calumny. No other reaſon can be aſſigned for inſerting either of their names in the Jockey Club. As well might he have included alſo their Royal Highneſs's ſon and daughter, Prince William and Princeſs Sophia.

*Jam nova progenies cœlo demittitur alto.*

---

## DUCHESS OF CUMBERLAND.

*Amicitiæ Anima.*

IT would have been a miracle indeed, if this moſt amiable Ducheſs had not had a place among ſuch a group of ſplendid characters

racters as is to be found in the Jockey Club. But no ſituation can diſhonour her who never was diſhonoured. Truly eſtimable among the happy, truly virtuous among the gay, her preſence is ever courted, ever eſteemed. It is not forgot, that the late Duke's finances were greatly deranged when he married this very ſenſible and moſt charming woman. With a complacency that reflects the higheſt honour upon her character, ſhe condeſcended to undertake the ſuperintendence of his affairs. She, with a penetration not uſual to thoſe in elevated ſituations, ſaw her huſband plundered by rapacity; official duties were neglected, ignorant ſubalterns were ſubſtituted, and, in a word, all the abuſes of truſt were practiſed in every department. All theſe her Royal Highneſs reformed and corrected; and eſtabliſhed a ſyſtem of œconomy and regulation, by which incumbrances were diſcharged, emancipation was obtained, and the Royal rank, ſo far from being degraded, was honoured and ſupported by additional ſplendour. Happy would it be for many people of faſhion, if their ladies poſſeſſed the good ſenſe, the œconomy, and elevated ideas of the Ducheſs of Cumberland!

MRS.

## MRS. FITZHERBERT.

*Sweet delight of human kind,*
*Bred on high,*
*To crown the favourites of the ſky,*
*With more of happineſs below*
*Than victors in a triumph know.* PARNEL.

WHEN the Prince is attacked, Mrs. Fitzherbert muſt be brought forward as a matter of courſe. It is not whether ſhe deſerves it, that makes any part of the conſideration. In theſe things the propriety is not adverted to; nor does the writer of the Jockey Club care a ſtraw whether Mrs. Fitzherbert is truly or falſely repreſented; a repreſentation of ſome ſort muſt be ſet forth, and invention muſt ſupply the place of fact. The pages muſt be filled; and it is no difficult thing to a man who has lived in all ſituations, who has been an inhabitant of ſo many jails, who has been guilty of ſo many enormities, who never poſſeſſed a ſingle atom of either virtue or honeſty, to write whole ſheets of abuſe and ſlander.

Of Mrs. Fitzherbert it is not neceſſary to ſay much. Her moral character is untouched. It is invulnerable. It is out of the reach of

of calumny. Her numerous friends, of the faireſt characters and higheſt ſtations, bear ample and public teſtimony of this truth. Her family and relations are all perſons of unſpotted purity.

Whatever the influence of a moſt amiable lady may be, we know, from the diſappointments of a thouſand applications, that no uſe has been made of it, in any appointments, regulations, or meaſures, of any kind; well aware, as ſhe undoubtedly muſt be, that any interference from her, even in the minutiæ, would be immediately, by the repreſentations of the envious and the malignant, ſwelled into a crime of the greateſt enormity. No perſon has, therefore, attempted to fix, or to make any accuſation of this ſort. No abuſe of private influence, no abuſe of public intereſt, can attach to her character; becauſe there is not the ſhadow of a foundation, nor the pretence of a ſuſpicion, for either. She knows,

*Reaſon's whole pleaſure, all the joys of ſenſe,*
*Lie in three words,* health, peace, *and* competence. POPE.

Admired where ſhe is ſeen, eſteemed where ſhe is known, beloved by her friends, and reſpected by all.

DUKE

## DUKE OF BRUNSWICK.

*Campis benè notus et Aulis.*

THIS Duke is no member of the Jockey Club, and conſequently every reader muſt be ſurpriſed to find him included in it. But this Duke having been engaged in a political or rather military meaſure inimical to the politics of the writer of the Jockey Club, he recommends for that reaſon, and for that reaſon only, the aſſaſſination of his Serene Highneſs. Now although it is no matter what cauſe the Duke of Brunſwick is engaged in, or has been engaged in, it is certainly true, that aſſaſſination is neither the proper reward, nor the proper puniſhment, of ſuch conduct. No perſon who calls himſelf the friend of mankind can approve of the Duke's accepting of a command, that had for its object the overthrow of a mode of government which a great nation had choſen for itſelf. But it muſt be remembered, that his Highneſs's former conduct, particularly under his great relation the late Duke Ferdinand of Brunſwick, was highly ſplendid and glorious, and ſhewed him to be a commander of the greateſt gallantry and bravery.

## DUKE OF BEDFORD.

*Non intelligunt homines quam vectigal ſit parſimonia.* TULL.

THE writer of the Jockey Club lays a heavy charge againſt his Grace, viz. *That he is frugal.* Might not his Grace reply in the above words of Tully?——It is more than probable, that our diſſipated author has applied to the Duke for money, and has been treated not ſo well as he deſerved; that is, he has only been refuſed. From this circumſtance he affirms, the Duke is parſimonious.

The circumſtance reflects honour upon his Grace's diſcernment and judgment. To his family, to all deſerving objects, and to his tenants, no man is more tender and liberal than the Duke of Bedford.

There is another circumſtance that alſo reflects great honour upon his Grace. It is ſaid that he avoids all *deep play.*

The writer of the Jockey Club is highly offended that none of his brother-blacklegs, can obtain any part of the Duke's eſtate to ſhare amongſt them. They are exceedingly diſappointed in their wiſhes, and hence ariſes their ſilly and impotent abuſe. The Duke may reply *hoſtis honori invidia.*

## DUKE OF DORSET.

———*Multorum vidit et urbes.*

THE private character of this Nobleman is like that of many other of his ſtanding and faſhion, chequered with one or two venial blemiſhes, but with no capital vices. His public character is not ſtained by any ſeries of conduct, or ſingle tranſaction, that has deſerved or produced the ſmalleſt reproach. His Grace may therefore deſpiſe the ſhafts of envy and malice.

## DUKE OF GRAFTON.

*Bene præparatum pectus.*

THIS Noble Duke has borne a public part in the State, as well as at Newmarket. The writer of the Jockey Club ſays nothing of his Grace's conduct at the latter, conſequently we may juſtly conclude there is no room for cenſure on that head. His Grace's character as a Miniſter, is like that of every other Miniſter, liable to a great deal of miſrepreſentation. But *murus aheneus conſcientia ſana.* The malevolence of Junius was exhibited at an unpopular time. But the writings of Junius had no more influence on the Duke of Graſton, than the writings of Wilkes had upon Lord Bute. It ſuited the purpoſes of party to ſay, that thoſe writers drove theſe miniſters from the helm. But the fact is otherwiſe, for Lord Bute reſigned *voluntarily*, as ſoon as he had finiſhed the buſineſs he came in to

execute, which was the making of the peace. And the Duke of Grafton reſigned, becauſe he diſapproved of the meaſures preparing againſt America.

## DUKE OF LEEDS.

*Rari quippe boni, numero vix ſunt totidem quot Thebarum porta, vel divitis oſtia Nili.*
JUV.

IF a Nobleman of the moſt amiable manners and diſpoſition, whoſe private life defies the inſinuation of calumny, and whoſe public conduct has throughout been conſiſtent, upright, and honourable, cannot eſcape the ſlander of the writer of the Jockey Club; he muſt have taken a reſolution to abuſe, revile, and vilify all mankind. To ſupply what he does not know, he invents; and what he invents is falſe. In a word, the Duke of Leeds is one of the moſt reſpectable characters in the Britiſh Peerage.

DUKE

## DUKE OF MONTROSE.

THIS Nobleman is ſtated to have committed two capital faults. One is, he was born on the North ſide of the Tweed; and the other is, that he is the friend of Mr. Pitt. The beſt anſwer to ſuch traſh, is—*vultus animum indicat.*

## DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH.

*Comitatûs ſui decus.*

WITH the writer of the Jockey Club, his Grace's only crime is the ſame as that of his noble relation the Duke of Bedford. They are both guilty of the horrid crime of witholding their eſtates, from the villainous gripe of Gamblers. The very honourable and dignified deportment which the noble Duke preſerves is highly offenſive to all the Swindling Societies of Sharks, Rooks, and Blacklegs. His Grace does not condeſcend

deſcend to aſſociate with any of them. He never bets nor games—conſequently he is food for malevolence, acrimony, and ſlander. But

*He jeſts at ſcars who ne'er received a wound.*

SHAK.

## DUKE OF NORFOLK.

*Contendiſſe decorum eſt.*

THE inconſiſtency of the writer of the Jockey Club, is perfectly conſiſtent with his ſlander. He condemns the very thing in one page, which he warmly recommends in another. He ſhews, or affects to ſhew, in one part of his work, the neceſſity of a Reform of Parliament. And under the name of this premier Duke, he condemns and reviles the attempt, or firſt ſtep to accompliſh that Reform. If ever any reform is obtained, the neceſſity of which is ſo

ſtrongly held out by the writer of the Jockey Club, this noble Duke muſt be a principal inſtrument in it—like the Duke of Orleans in the French Revolution. But this random writer makes no diſtinction. He ſhews no diſcretion. Friend or foe—it is all one—ſo it is but a great name to vent ſpleen upon. No matter the ſubject. What is deprecated in one page, is reprobated in another. The noble Duke's hilarity and the preceding Duke's reſerve, are equally matters of condemnation. Such inconſiſtent cenſure can fix no ſtigma, can deſcribe no vice, but that which is lodged in the writer's own depravity.

## DUKE OF PORTLAND.

*Spes Almæ Matris.*

RESPECTED wherever he is known. Beloved by every one—*ab omnibus amatus.*—It was impoſſible to find or to invent, under any tolerable pretence, ſlander or cenſure upon this almoſt peerleſs character.—Where no charge either has been, or can be brought, no defence is neceſſary. No man can ſtand higher in eſtimation in private life; and, in the public ſphere, his virtue and integrity are proverbial.

DUKE

## DUKE OF QUEENSBURY.

*Artium Fautor.*

THERE is no pleaſing the writer of the Jockey Club. Some of the preceding Noblemen have been condemned for parſimony. This noble Duke is a *bon vivant*, and his Grace is condemned alſo; ſo that it matters not, whether you are œconomical or otherwiſe, you are equally liable to an undiſtinguiſhing indiſcriminate judgment that ſhowers down cenſure at random—that makes no difference between thoſe who have adminiſtered to his neceſſities, and thoſe who have not; or if at any time he does, it is in favour of the latter, with a view of obtaining the donation of a few guineas from them, which he knows will never be repeated by the former. Can we regard the malignity of a character ſo ſuperlatively baſe and worthleſs?

## DUKE OF RICHMOND.

*Quæ Regio in Terris, noſtra non plena laboris?*

AFTER reviling ſo many great and ſpotleſs characters, it muſt ſurpriſe every reader to find a panegyric, where he would leaſt expect it. But the writer admits his Grace to be unpopular; and therefore to ſhew that he is reſolved to be in eternal oppoſition to all public opinion, he abuſes the Duke of Leeds, and praiſes the Duke of Richmond.

One ſubject of the writer's panegyric, is his Grace's opinion on a Reform of Parliament. On this ſubject, good men as well as great men, differ. But his Grace's ideas are beſt given in his own language. They are contained in the following:

COPY

## COPY OF A LETTER FROM HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF RICHMOND.

To the Chairman of a Meeting of the County of Suſſex, convened at Lewes, January 18, 1783, for the purpoſe of preſenting a Petition to the Houſe of Commons, to take into conſideration the unequal State of Repreſentation in Parliament.

*Whitehall, Jan.* 17, 1783.

" SIR,

" YOU may eaſily believe, that being one of thoſe who joined in requeſting you to call a County Meeting, nothing but illneſs can prevent my attending it, and it is with infinite regret I ſubmit to the deciſion of my phyſicians, who pronounce that it is not ſafe for me to leave London.

" I truſt that my ſentiments on the ſubject of *Parliamentary Reform* are in general ſufficiently known, and that without further aſſurances I might be *depended upon for giving it every ſupport in my power;* but ſome circumſtances made me wiſh to ſtate them as briefly as poſſible to the County of Suſſex. They are formed on the *experience of twenty ſix years*, which, whether in or out

of government, has equally convinced me, that the *reſtoration of a genuine Houſe of Commons*, by a *renovation* of the *Rights of the People*, is the *only effectual remedy* againſt that *ſyſtem of Corruption*, which has brought the Nation to diſgrace and poverty, and threatens it with the *loſs of Liberty*.

" I take the grievance of the preſent ſtate of Election, to be its *groſs inequality*. All the Electors in Great Britain do not amount to *one ſixth* part of the whole people, and a ſtill *greater* inequality ſubſiſts in Elections made by that ſixth part; for *one-ſeventh part* of *them* elect a majority, ſo that *one-forty-ſecond* part of the Nation diſpoſe of the *property of the whole*, and have their *lives and liberties at command*. And this forty-ſecond part, far from conſiſting of the moſt opulent part of the kingdom, is compoſed of the ſmall Boroughs, moſt of which are become either the private property of individuals, or are *notoriouſly ſold* to the beſt bidder; ſo that the *Counties* and *great Cities* are, in fact, as well as the *great maſs of the people*, ſwallowed up by a *ſyſtem of corruption*.

" My ideas of reform undoubtedly go to one that ſhall be *complete*, and *general throughout the kingdom*. I ſee ſuch fatal conſequences ariſe from the preſent partial and

and accidental ſtate of election, that I cannot take upon me to propoſe any new mode that partakes of the ſame defects. If we do not differ from the *abettors of corruption* upon the broad principle of inequality in Election, and the UNIVERSAL RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE to be REPRESENTED, and are contending only for a degree of partiality, more or leſs, I fear our ground is not ſound; if we mean only to ſubſtantiate partiality for partiality, and are ſtruggling but for its extent, one man's whim may be as good as another's conceit, and we have nothing certain to direct us; and if inequality is ſtill to ſubſiſt, the advocates of the preſent ſyſtem will have the ſanction of time and the riſk of changes, to oppoſe to us, which will have their weight when it is but for a change of partiality that we contend.

"I have thought that a *Parliamentary Reform* had much more ſimple and unerring guides to lead us to our end; I mean the *true principles of the Conſtitution, and the Rights of the People.* If theſe exiſt, I do not conſider myſelf at liberty to ſpeculate upon ſyſtems, I have no choice, but to give to every man his own.

"How far it is wiſe for thoſe who entirely agree in principles upon the RIGHTS OF MEN, to endeavour to perſuade them that

the *recovery of their birth rights*, and *moſt eſſential intereſts*" are not reducible to practice, nor attainable by any regular, or conſtitutional efforts of theirs," is what I muſt leave others to determine. But the truth of this aſſertion is what I can never ſubſcribe to. I cannot but think that this Nation ever had it in its own power, by *peaceful and conſtitutional efforts to do itſelf juſtice*; and that nothing can render attempts for this purpoſe impracticable, but either a GENERAL INDOLENCE *and* INDIFFERENCE TO ALL THAT REQUIRES EXERTION, though for the NOBLEST PURPOSES, or prejudice to favourite ſyſtems as ſhall divide the people.

"To guard againſt ſuch an imputation falling on me, I am moſt ready to agree to an Addreſs in the moſt general terms, not pointing to any ſpecific mode of Reform in the Petition, or by inſtructions to our Members, or by Reſolutions, but ſubmitting the remedy, as in my opinion it ought to be, in the firſt inſtance, to parliament itſelf; which I conceive to be, at leaſt, as equal to ſuch a conſideration, as any Provincial Committee.

"Should Mr. Wyvil's firſt or ſecond plan be propoſed in parliament, or any thing like it, although I ſhall lament, that we, for a mo-

a moment, quit our advantageous ground of the CONSTITUTION *and the* RIGHTS OF MEN, yet I ſhall certainly give every ſupport in my power to this or any other amendment, and it certainly will be a conſiderable improvement, that inſtead of a *forty-ſecond*, it ſhould be a *thirty-ſixth* or *thirtieth* part that ſhall decide the concerns of the *whole people*. It will be ſomething material they will have gained, and may become a *ſtep to the more eaſy attainment of their full privileges*.

"I ſhall moſt ſincerely hope that that plan may be found attainable: but I never can conſent to tell the people, and *I hope in God they never will believe that the recovery of any right which Nature and the Conſtitution has given them, is impracticable.*— On the contrary, *convinced myſelf*, I wiſh them ever to believe, that *whenever they pleaſe to claim them, they* WILL *and* MUST have the FULL EXTENT OF THEIR RIGHTS.

"I have thought it neceſſary to ſay thus much on an impreſſion I cannot think indifferent the public ſhould entertain.

"The meaſure for which you are aſſembled meets with my hearty concurrence; and I ſhall be happy if theſe my ſentiments, which

which I beg you would communicate to the Meeting of the County of Suſſex, ſhould meet with their approbation.

" It is with the higheſt eſteem and regard that I have the honour to be,

" SIR,

Your moſt obedient

And humble Servant,

RICHMOND, &c."

*To William Frankland, Eſq.*
*High Sheriff of the County of Suſſex.*

## MARQUIS OF LANSDOWNE.

*Factis, non Verbis.*

THE writer of the Jockey Club has made a laboured defence of this nobleman, ſome parts of which we ſhall not diſpute; becauſe, it is not the deſign of this work to calumniate any one. His Lordſhip is undoubtedly a great character; but it is chequered with inſtances of inconſtancy and inconſiſtency. He ſet out with an attachment to Lord Bute, whom he afterwards abandoned. He quarrelled with Lord Holland on a point of veracity. He ſupported Lord Bute's peace, and afterwards adopted Lord Chatham's politics. And early in the year 1772 he offered to abandon Lord Chatham, but the Court would not accept of him. He made Mr. Pitt Miniſter and now oppoſes him. He offered a little while ago, to join the Party then called "The Armed Neutrality," but they rudely anſwered, "They intended to preſerve their characters." Yet, notwitſtanding all theſe

little blemiſhes, his Lordſhip is, what the world calls a great man. He can ſpeak two hours upon a ſubject, and when he has done no man can decide whether he meant to ſupport or oppoſe it. No Peer is more nervous and powerful in debate—when he has made up his mind; but his Lordſhip is apt to refine too much, which occaſions a ſort of verſatility in his conduct, that throws great diſtruſt on his opinions and politics.

His knowledge of foreign affairs and foreign courts is unequalled. It is ſuperior and better than that of any other perſon in either Houſe of Parliament. But with all this knowledge, united with great talents, he wants the knowledge of mankind. When he took the head of the treaſury in 1782, his firſt ſtep ſhould have been a diſſolution of Parliament. He would thereby have ſecured his ſituation. But he ſaw not his own danger, or more properly ſpeaking, he did ſuſpect what he ought to have known to a certainty, the diſpoſition of the Houſe of Commons; and it does not ſeem to have

oc-

occurred to his memory, that the Houſe of Commons he accepted, had been elected by Lord North, who being gone into oppoſition, would conſequently carry all his friends with him.

Lord Lanſdowne during his ſhort adminiſtration aſſumed the majeſty of Lord Chatham. But he either forgot, or did not know, that when Lord Chatham (then Mr. Pitt) was made Miniſter in 1758, he *had* coaleſced with the Duke of Newcaſtle, by whom the Parliament had been elected, and conſequently the Duke's majority was transferred to Lord Chatham, which Lord Chatham himſelf thus deſcribes, "I borrowed the Duke of Newcaſtle's majority "to carry on the public buſineſs." *See the Anecdotes of Lord Chatham's Life.* If the Duke of Newcaſtle had gone into oppoſition, Mr. Pitt muſt have diſſolved the Parliament. The beſt apology, therefore, that can be made for Lord Lanſdowne in this matter, is, that he fell a ſacrifice to his own confidence

## EARL OF BARRYMORE.

*Luſiſti ſatis, atque biliſti;*
*Tempus abire tibi eſt.* HOR.

## EARL CLERMONT.

*Turpi ſecernit honeſtum.*

## EARL OF CHESTERFIELD.

*Jocoſus et Prudens.*

HAS the happy merit of being a facetious companion, and an excellent bon vivant. The joke, the jeu d'eſprit, and the glaſs, all ſet the table on a roar. But mirth excites the choler of our cynic. He cannot endure any perſon to partake of pleaſure—it is a hereſy worſe than Judaiſm. Yet he affects to lament the execution of ſome criminals, whom the law had conſigned to an ignominious death. The circumſtance has

has no relation to the noble Earl. But it is foiſted in to ſupply the want of other matter, and his Majeſty is moſt groſsly and irreverently treated upon a ſuppoſition that he ought to have pardoned them. To have pardoned them from the mere peculiarity of the period, and not from any merits in the caſe, would have been denominated a denial of juſtice, and a proſtitution of favour; neither of which can be charged upon any of thoſe ſervants who have uſually adviſed the Crown upon any of theſe occaſions.

## EARL OF COVENTRY.

*Meminiſſe juvat.*

WHEN a man writes to gratify his malice or to feed the vulgar appetite for ſlander, it is indifferent what he ſays, either to himſelf, or to the reader of the characters he pretends to delineate. If he knows but little of them, which is in general the caſe, he may miſrepreſent

preſent ſome truth, or if this is not very eaſy, he can ſupply the omiſſion, by an ample invention of falſehood and abuſe. And by concealing his name, he conceives that he may indulge with ſecurity and ſafety in the moſt extravagant licentiouſneſs. If a man ſets his name to his work, the world knowing his character for veracity, will, according to the goodneſs or badneſs of that, give credit or refuſe it, to what he ſays of others, POPE ſays very juſtly.

*Let ſuch teach others, who themſelves excel.*

Which in plain proſe ſignifies, Let none preſume to blame others, who are not themſelves free from faults.

If the writer of the Jockey Club had obſerved this maxim, he would not have waſted ſo much time and labour in miſrepreſenting and libelling many of the beſt and faireſt characters in our Iſland.

Lord Coventry's character for humanity and philanthropy is too well-known too re-elucidation or quire any vindication.

## EARL OF CHATHAM.

——*Uno avulſo, non deficit alter*
*Aurcus.*——

THE world will not thank the writer of the Jockey Club for his portrait of this noble Earl. If he inherits not the eloquence of his noble father, he poſſeſſes all his ardour of mind, all his ſpirit of action, and all his courage in conflict. Lord Dorcheſter can teſtify the laſt in his Lordſhip's behaviour in Canada, particularly between the river St. Lawrence and Lake Champlain, where his Lordſhip, though in a ſubordinate ſituation, behaved with an intrepidity that is unequalled.

The firmneſs and ſpirit of his Lordſhip's conduct in Canada, in more than one or two inſtances during the American war, are notorious. They are well known to the Britiſh army, and to the Americans.

His Lordſhip is now at the head of the Britiſh Admiralty, and the writer of the Jockey Club tells us, that no perſon ought to hold this poſt but a ſeaman. It is not neceſſary here to diſpute the propriety or im-

impropriety of this poſition, but, if a judgment may be formed of it from ſome recent and well known facts, all the difficulty will lie in a very narrow compaſs. It has been admitted, by every ſeaman of character, that the buſineſs of the admiralty was never ſo well attended, nor ſo impartially adminiſtered, as during the adminiſtrations of Lord Egmont and Lord Sandwich; nor, compared with them, ſo badly, as during the adminiſtrations of Sir Charles Saunders, Lord Hawke, Lord Howe, and Lord Keppel. It is, perhaps, not a vulgar error, but at leaſt it is a recent one to ſay, that a profeſſional man ought to be head of the board of Admiralty.

From the reſtoration of Charles the Second, to the preſent day, the majority of the heads of this department have been landmen. And, during this period, the fleet of Great Britain has made the moſt brilliant figure. A few of the names of theſe landmen are (for it is proper to recite them leſt the fact ſhould be diſputed) as follows:

Prince

Prince Rupert, Lord Nottingham, Lord Pembroke, Lord Cornwallis, Lord Oxford, Lord Bridgwater, Prince of Denmark, Lord Strafford, Lord Berkeley, Lord Winchelſea, Duke of Bedford, Lord Sandwich, Lord Temple, Lord Halifax, George Grenville, Lord Egmont, and Lord Chatham.

If any neglect of duty, or abuſe of power could have been charged on the laſt mentioned nobleman, there can be no doubt the charge would have been diſplayed in the brighteſt colours, for he who has not ſpared his friends, who has pourtrayed them in language the moſt unjuſt as well as the moſt ungrateful, we may be aſſured, would not have ſhewn the ſmalleſt lenity to thoſe who have the honour to be totally unknown to him, and to ſhare his contemptible and avowed diſapprobation.

---

## Earl of Derby.

*Amicorum Deliciæ.*

THIS noble Earl is one of the writer's own friends to liberty and conviviality :— "More ſi d againſt than ſinning."

Few men have more friends than the Earl of Derby. Scarcely any man is more reſpected by thoſe friends; yet neither this general character, which is univerſally known to be true, nor his ſeveral acts of benevolence to the writer of the Jockey Club, are ſufficient to protect the noble Earl from the ungrateful malignity of his pen. The neighbourhood of Knowſley, and all Lancaſhire, can teſtify his Lordſhip's private worth. All thoſe who have had the honour of his Lordſhip's aſſociation, have been witneſſes of the amiable qualities of his heart; all thoſe who have attended to public affairs, have obſerved the purity of his Lordſhip's conduct in parliament. *Quo virtus, quo ferat error?*

HOR.

---

## EARL OF EGREMONT.

*Stat per ſe.*

WHERE nothing is blamed, nothing is to be defended.

EARL

EARL GROSVENOR.

*Pro Patria ſemper.*

HIS paternal and fraternal regards are well known. They reflect honour upon his character and conduct.

EARL OF HARRINGTON.

*Mens Sana in Corpore Sano.*

IN this inſtance, the writer of the Jockey Club has not deviated from truth; he might have ſaid more, but he could not ſay leſs of this amiable and much eſteemed nobleman. He muſt be an immaculate character indeed, who tranſcends Lord Harrington in virtue and honour.

EARL OF LEICESTER.

*Præbet Titulis honorem.*

WHEN the Marquis (then Viſcount) Townſhend heard that his eldeſt ſon was created an Earl, he ſaid, "Though he precedes me here, I hope he will not precede

me in Heaven." The father is now out of his pain, by being advanced to the dignity of Marquis. This honour to the father, was an old promiſe that ought to have been performed ſeveral years before it was.

The Earl of Leiceſter is accuſed of parſimony, which, being tranſlated into plain Engliſh, is as follows:

His Lordſhip has refuſed to adminiſter to the extravagancies of the unprincipled writer of the Jockey Club.

---

## EARL OF UPPER OSSORY.

*Culpæ non affinis ulli.*

IT is a well known truth, that when a Gentleman has ſufficient property and influence to return himſelf member for the county in which he lives, he muſt be a member of great reſpectability and intereſt of character, as well as of great eſteem in both private and public life; and that ſuch is the character and ſituation of Lord Oſſory, every one who knows the county of Bedford, or his Lordſhip, can ſay is true.

LORD

## LORD VISCOUNT STORMONT.

*Peregrinis magnus in Aulis.*

A great diplomatic character, who has ever upheld the honour of the crown, and the rights of the nation, at home and abroad.

However ſtrong, juſt, and natural his attachment to his uncle may be, yet it is highly to his Lordſhip's honour, that this attachment has no influence upon his conduct in parliament—witneſs the warm ſupport his Lordſhip gave to Mr. Fox's libel bill.

At the laſt general election his Lordſhip was honoured with the flattering diſtinction of having the greateſt number of votes in his favour, although he had not the ſupport of the miniſtry. This honourable confidence of his brother Peers, was not more a tribute to his ſuperior merit, than a public proof of their high opinion of his great talents and ſtrict integrity.

## LORD AUCKLAND.

*Integer vitæ, ſceleriſque purus.*

THIS noble Lord was a ſtudent in the Temple. He was ſelected from thence for his merit, and he has riſen to his preſent ſituation and honour, purely by his merit. His attachment to Lord Carliſle, when Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, is well known and remembered. And whatever merit there was in, or whatever advantage was intended to have been derived to the public from the union of Mr. Fox and Lord North, or the famous coalition as it was called at that time, is a truth very well known within all the circles of faſhion, that the credit and advantages of that meaſure, were excluſively the right of Lord Auckland. He carried on and ſettled the whole negociation, and infinite pains and trouble he took in it; for it required no ſmall ſhare of addreſs and abilites to reconcile ſuch jarring intereſts, ſuch oppoſition of ſentiment, ſuch different attachments, ſuch diſtinct views, in ſhort, every thing that could be included under the word obſtacle, was to be

be overcome and done away. Whether the Public ſaw the meaſure in the light that it was intended to operate, does not affect the character of the negotiator.—The conſequences of the meaſure did not belong to him. He faithfully performed what he undertook.

From this circumſtance, Mr. Pitt became acquainted with his Lordſhip's abilities in negotiation; and, from the private uſe of individuals, he wiſhed to transfer them to the uſe of the public. He detached Lord Auckland from the oppoſition, and accompliſhed his object. It is certainly more honourable to his Lordſhip, and more advantageous to the country, that his talents ſhould be employed in the ſervice of the nation, in preference to that of party.

His Lordſhip early devoted a great part of his attention to the ſtudy and acquaintance of that great ſcience Commerce, which, of all others, is moſt intereſting to the natives of theſe kingdoms. He improved and extended his knowledge in this ſcience, during his reſidence in America and Ireland,

land, and afterwards in England, by an almoſt conſtant intercourſe for ſome years, and frequent conferences with many of the firſt manufacturers in different branches, Meſſrs. Wedgwood, Boulton, Walker, &c. &c. Thus qualified, no man in the kingdom was ſo proper to undertake the negotiation of a commercial treaty with France. For this purpoſe Mr. Pitt ſent him to Paris, and the hopes and expectations of the nation were in no part diſappointed. The contents of that treaty are too well known to be repeated here; but the wiſdom, policy, and equity of the treaty, will be an indelible monument of his ſkill, judgment, and prudence.

His long reſidence at the Hague, which is the moſt difficult, arduous, and hazardous ſituation of all our foreign miniſters, is the moſt unequivocal proof of his talents and addreſs for a great diplomatic character.

---

LORD FOLEY.

*Poſt nubila Phœbus.*

LORD

## LORD GRENVILLE.

*Me Pater Æneas, et Avunculus excitat Hector.*

THIS nobleman is the ſecond ſon of that great miniſter the late Mr. Grenville. He was early introduced into public buſineſs—has been Speaker of the Houſe of Commons, and is now Secretary of State for the Foreign Department; in which ſituations, as well as in every other he has been, he has acquitted himſelf highly to his own honour, and to the advantage of his country. Deſcended from a family renowned for great and reſpectable talents, his Lordſhip inherits from them a warm and ſincere attachment to the intereſts of theſe kingdoms and their dependencies, as well as a manly and patriotic ſpirit to uphold their credit and conſequence in the vaſt eye of all foreign countries. His attention to all the foreign miniſters, is at once polite and dignified, becoming not more his rank, than the elevated ſituation of a ſplendid, happy, and powerful nation.

## LORD HAWKESBURY.

*Tramite Recto.*

IF this motto does not point to public meaſures, it will at leaſt apply to his Lordſhip's *ultimatum*.

When at Oxford, he was intended for the church; but writing ſome ſquibs in ſupport of the Whig intereſt in the Oxfordſhire election of 1754, he was taken notice of by Lord Harcourt, and by his Lordſhip introduced to Lord Holderneſſe, at that time Secretary of State, who made him a ſupernumary clerk in his office. By Dr. Barton, of St. Andrew's, Holborn, to whom he was diſtantly related, he was introduced to Lord Portſmouth, who countenanced him a good deal. In the year 1757, when the militia was raiſed, he wrote a pamphlet in ſupport of that meaſure; next year, when the Dutch ſhips were taken on account of their carrying ſtores to France, he wrote a pamphlet in ſupport of that meaſure alſo. This pamphlet happening to pleaſe Mr. George Grenville, then Treaſurer

Treaſurer of the Navy, he took the author to the Duke of Newcaſtle, and abſolutely inſiſted on his Grace giving him ſome reward. There being at that time, no place vacant the Duke gave him a penſion of five hundred pounds a year: and ſoon afterwards he was put upon the eſtabliſhment in the Secretary of State's office. He acquitted himſelf ſo well in the duties of the office, that when Lord Bute came in, upon the removal of Lord Holderneſſe, he was advanced in the office, and Lord Bute made him his confidential Secretary. And when Lord Bute went to the Treaſury, he took him with him, and continued him in the ſame capacity. He was made Auditor to the Princeſs of Wales, the ſalary of which, together with his penſion, he ſtill enjoys. His other places have been all given to him ſince that time. He was of ſingular ſervice to Lord Bute in the diſpute which he had with the city of London, concerning the exciſe upon Cyder. And he has been upon all occaſions, the Eleve and Agent of that noble Lord. To this attachment is to

be aſcribed, the extraordinary countenance with which he has been honoured by his Majeſty, alſo his Peerage and numerous places. His influence over public meaſures, eſpecially during the American War (and there are perſons who ſay it is not diminiſhed at this day, particularly in the Slave Trade), was abſolute and uncontroulable. This has not failed to create him many enemies, for all favourites have enemies. Envy and reproach are the inſeparable concomitants of favouritiſm.

## Lord Kenyon.

*— Genus et proavos, et quæ non fecimus ipſi,*
*Vix ea noſtra voco.*

This noble Lord was raiſed to his preſent high ſtation and to the Peerage, by the neceſſity of the times, and the favour of the late Lord Chancellor. The firſt was fortuitous, the laſt was honourable.

Lord

## LORD ONSLOW.

*Vitæ benè actæ jucundiſſima recordatio eſt.*

THIS noble Lord was bred in the Whig principles of the late reign. He began his public career with oppoſing Lord Bute, and ſupporting John Wilkes. But when Lord Rockingham came into adminiſtration, in 1765, his Lordſhip ſaw there was not ſo much danger in the meaſures of the Court, as he at firſt had apprehended; he took a place, and has become reconciled to St. James's ever ſince.

## LORD THURLOW.

*—Non tamen irritum,*
*Quodcunque retro eſt efficiet, neque*
*Deſſinget, infectumque reddet,*
*Quod fugiens ſemel hora vexit.*

THIS noble Lord owes his elevation to a circumſtance but very little known.

When General Wolfe was killed at Quebec, (who by the bye, has been much more honoured than he merited, for a few hours before the action he complained of being cold, General Monkton gave him ſome brandy, and he drank ſo freely he was literally intoxicated,)the command devolved upon General Townſhend, now Marquis Townſhend. Upon this occaſion ſomebody wrote a ſevere pamphlet on General Townſhend's conduct at Quebec. It was called a Letter to a Brigadier General, and as it alſo contained a ſort of of ſide-wind, but ample vindication of Lord George Sackville's conduct at Minden, the pamphlet was generally aſcribed to his Lordſhip. At this time Lord Thurlow, then Mr. Thurlow, was a young barriſter in the Temple: And it has been generally underſtood and believed, that the pamphlet, called a Refutation of the above Letter to a Brigadier General, was the production of his maiden pen; that this Refutation was the cauſe of his introduction to Lord

Lord Townſhend, who afterwards brought him into Parliament for Tamworth. It is to be obſerved that there is no diſgrace in the tranſaction. There are other gentlemen who owe their advancement to their pens. Mr. Cooper (now Sir Grey Cooper, Bart.) another young Barriſter in the Temple, wrote a pamphlet on the Change of the Miniſtry in 1756, called A Pair of Spectacles for Short Sighted Politicians, which introduced him to Lord Rockingham, who made him one of the Secretaries to the Treaſury for it, and likewiſe gave him a penſion to take place whenever he was removed, becauſe he could not return to the Bar.

Lord Thurlow was not much known at the Bar. He made his debut as an orator in Parliament, where he has ſhewn that he poſſeſſed very ſtrong powers, ſound manly ſenſe, and a moſt dignified manner, that has never failed to impreſs conviction. When pleading at the Bar of the Houſe of Lords, it has been obſerved that he has ſtruck Lord Mansfield with fear and trembling.

As

As Lord Chancellor his decrees have given univerſal ſatisfaction. They were very rarely appealed from, and only one has been reverſed. He has principally attached himſelf to the Marquis of Bath and the Marquis of Stafford. From the hours of conviviality, the acquaintance became affection. He has uniformly ſupported, from the moment of his entrance into office, except towards the cloſe of the laſt Seſſion, when he oppoſed Mr. Roſe's bill, and a bill of Mr. Pitt's concerning finance. His conduct on the Regency buſineſs, reflected great honour on his Lordſhip, and was highly approved by the public. But having, as hath been obſerved, oppoſed Mr. Pitt in the laſt Seſſion of Parliament, Mr. Pitt reſolved to reſign if the Chancellor was not removed. The deciſion was with his Majeſty. One of them muſt go out. If Mr. Pitt had gone out, many would have followed him. The Chancellor carried nobody. His Majeſty decided to part with his Chancellor.

## LORD BELGRAVE.

*Charus amicis.*

## LORD GOWER.

*Sævis tranquillus in undis.*

HIS Lordſhip diſcharged his duties as an ambaſſador at Paris, during a very difficult and perilous time, with honour to himſelf and ſatisfaction to his ſovereign.—But he gave no dinners at Paris to the writer of the Jockey Club—nor lent him any money. Reader, theſe are his Lordſhip's faults.

## LORD EDWARD BENTINCK.

*Purus ab omni labe.*

## LORD GEORGE H. CAVENDISH.

*Inculpatus.*

## LORD JOHN TOWNSHEND.

*Poſt tot naufragia portum.*

## MR. JUSTICE BULLER.

*Hilariſque, tamen cum pondere, virtus.* STAT.

UNDER this character the writer of the Jockey Club has thought proper to introduce certain cuſtoms, or abuſes as he terms them, in the King's Bench priſon, in which priſon he having paſſed ſeveral months, it is poſſible that his deſcription may, in ſome degree, be true. But what connection has Mr. Buller with them? He neither created them nor authoriſed them.

Next comes a moſt violent attack upon all attornies in their profeſſional capacity. Some part of the heavy charge he brings may be very true, reſpecting ſome attornies; but it is certainly not true againſt every gentleman in that line; for it is well known, that there are in it many as well-bred gentlemen, as gentle in manners, and poſſeſſing as much true tenderneſs, as any of the moſt benevolent characters in phyſic or ſurgery. But candour muſt admit, that there are ſeveral of the profeſſion of attornies, who are not only a diſ-

a diſgrace to the profeſſion, but a diſgrace to human nature; they are the peſt of ſociety; capable of any, and of every, act that can degrade the nature and character of man. And it is incumbent upon every court, as well for its own honour, as for the credit of the laws, that when the conduct of any ſuch perſon comes before them, either immediately, or relatively only, to order an inquiry to be made, and to puniſh the delinquent; in order to prevent the practice of abuſe, and deluſion in others. The profeſſors of the law can never be too pure. Nothing but preventing abuſe in the practitioners, can ſecure to the laws their proper reſpect and authority. A baſe attorney is the vileſt character upon earth.

Mr. Buller's opinion of the law in caſes of libels has been controverted by Mr. Erſkine. But it does not yet ſeem to be decided which of them is right. Mr. Fox's bill on libels does not go far enough to eſtabliſh Mr. Erſkine's doctrine, nor is it ſtrong to overturn the Judge's. It is not quite certain whether that bill will do much good to the cauſe it was intended to ſerve; and it may be a doubt,

whether it has not armed the Judge with more power than he had before; for, under this bill, he can ſay to the Jury, that the libel he is trying is falſe, ſcandalous, malicious, ſeditious, treaſonable, and all the other epithets uſually applied on theſe occaſions in indictments and informations: Whereas, formerly, he only ſaid, that whether the matter charged was a libel, or not, belonged to the Court to determine. It may be permitted to obſerve, that this ſort of reſerve was leſs likely to have ſo great an influence over a Jury, than the latitude now given to the Judge, to denounce the matter in queſtion, by any terms and epithets he pleaſes. It is true, the Juries *may*, without fear or controul, aſſert and exerciſe their *rights:* But how ſeldom do we hear of Juries, in caſes of libel, acting otherwiſe than as the Judge directs them?

Here it cannot be improper to ſay a few words on this ſubject, which has made ſo much noiſe in the world.

And firſt, it muſt be ſaid, becauſe all experience has ſhewn it, that the crime of libel

is

is a mere matter of opinion. The ſame paper is a libel one day, and none another. It is ſometimes a libel in Weſtminſter-Hall and none at Guildhall (witneſs the trials of Junius's Letters). A matter of ſuch uncertainty, which affects the moſt valuable privilege we have, and is ſo often the ruin of individuals, ought to be ſettled upon ſome ſolid and permanent baſis. There cannot exiſt a greater grievance in any country, than that the criminal law, in a matter of ſuch importance, ſhould be *diſcretionary*. There ſhould be ſome marks, or limits, by which a libel can be known. No man at preſent knows what is a libel. Any thing that contains a reflection upon any perſon, is called a libel. Any thing that tends to excite diſtruſt in or of the government, is called a libel. If theſe poſitions are true, there can be no ſuch thing as a liberty of the preſs. It is ſcarcely poſſible to compoſe a writing, of any kind, that may not controvert ſome man's opinion. If Lettſom writes againſt Mayerſbach, it is a libel: If Mayerſbach reflects upon Lettſom, it is a libel: And yet the Public may profit by the contro-

controverſy. If a raſcally attorney, or any other infamous character, is expoſed, he calls it a libel; although ſuch expoſure is an act of public ſervice, by putting mankind on their guard againſt ſuch characters. If a ſcavenger is arraigned at the bar of the Public for not cleaning the ſtreets, he calls it a libel. In a word, every man of common ſenſe muſt ſee that the affair of libel is capable of being conſtrued, and extended to every thing that can be poſſibly thought or imagined. Then, in anſwer to this, it is laid down as law, that no man has a right to complain of another—he muſt ſeek redreſs at law: That is, in plain Engliſh, a ſtanding army of lawyers is to be kept up and maintained by the Public; and for the particular profit and maintenance of this army only, an infinite number of frivolous, vexatious, malicious, and conſtructive crimes, are to be encouraged, countenanced, and legalized; when public ſhame would do more to check and correct the guilty, than a thouſand proſecutions for libels. The preſs in all theſe caſes is the beſt monitor and corrector.

With

With reſpect to the other poſition, that any writing which tends to excite diſtruſt in government is a libel—it is infinitely more alarming and dangerous than the other.

If every writing of this kind be a libel, then all the papers which accelerated the Revolution, by which the preſent family came to the crown, were libels: Every paper that complains of any public grievance, is a libel: Every paragraph in every newſpaper, that blames the conduct of any miniſter, is a libel: In ſhort, it is impoſſible to ſay what political writing is not a libel, unleſs it be a panegyric on government. This is perfectly gagging the preſs. And it is impoſſible that any liberty can exiſt where ſuch *diſcretion* is lodged; for it is in the diſcretion of the Miniſtry, and the Attorney General, to denounce any writing a libel, that they think proper to call ſo.

Enough has been ſaid to convince any perſon of the danger of a diſcretionary power. There certainly ought to be ſome certain points eſtabliſhed, by which a libel ſhall be known.

known. Or if this is not to be done, though it can be as eaſily done as any other part of the criminal law can be ſettled and aſcertained; either permit the preſs to be as free as air, as it is in America and France; or put it at once under the reſtraint of a licenſer. This laſt was Lord Mansfield's idea of the liberty of the preſs. In ſeveral of his charges to Juries on trials for libels, he has ſaid, that the true meaning of the liberty of the preſs was no more than this, a liberty to print that book or paper *without* a licenſe, which formerly he [the defendant] might print *with* one.

Mr. Schieſner, in his late work, entitled, *An Explanation of the Practice of Law*, makes ſome very pertinent obſervations on this very intereſting ſubject of libel. The following is a part of what he ſays:

"Several of my friends have urged me to give my ſentiments on the ſubject of *libel*, as to the conſtitutional legality of the attorney-general's filing informations *ex officio*. As to that, I beg leave to obſerve, that I do not believe, in any one caſe whatever, that ſuch power was ever made uſe of for the public good. So great a power, lodged in the hands of any one individual, be that perſon who he

may, let his private character be ever ſo good, or his public abilities ever ſo great, muſt not alone be dangerous, but abſolutely pernicious. Judge Blackſtone, in treating of the court of King's Bench, has *indirectly* thrown the *greateſt ſarcaſm* on this part of our laws that ever man did. He tells you, that in this court has reſulted all that was good and ſalutary in the court of Star Chamber. I have only this queſtion to aſk, *What* ever was *good and ſalutary* in that court? And can there be any room to doubt, that the oppreſſions following from its decrees were among the firſt cauſes that contributed to the ruin of Charles the Firſt? Can there be a doubt but that they alienated from the breaſts of the people their love for their ſovereign? Is it then an unfair inference to draw, that the ſame, or a ſimilar cauſe, which loſt King Charles his monarchy, and his head into the bargain, may loſe us our valuable conſtitution? For informations *ex officio are the Star Chamber of the preſent day.* Having then called the mode of filing informations *ex officio* unconſtitutional, I ought, no doubt, to point out what is the conſtitutional method of proceeding in ſuch caſes. This, then, ſhortly is, *that a bill be preſented to a grand jury;* for by thoſe laws which regulate the liberties of Engliſhmen, no man, in a *criminal* caſe, ought to be condemned but by the judgment of twenty-four of his peers, at leaſt twelve of the grand jury, and the whole of the petit jury.

The firſt are to find whether there be good cauſe of accuſation; the ſecond, whether there be ſuch proof as ought to go to conviction.—And certainly the firſt is not leſs neceſſary than the ſecond. I ſee no reaſon why the attorney-general ſhould not preſent *his* bill before a grand jury, as well as a private individual. There would be no ſort of danger, were his cauſe a juſt one, but the ſame attention would be paid by a grand jury to a complaint coming from *him*, as from any other perſon."

On the practice of proſecuting a libel criminally, Mr. Schiefner ſays as follows:

" So far as regards *libel* in particular, which has already been defined a man's being abuſed, *either in writing or in print*, I queſtion much if it ought to be the ſubject of a criminal proſecution at all; for if any man have received any damage, or be likely to receive any, as the caſe may be, why not refer him to his *civil* action? The law, in that reſpect, ſeems perfectly competent to make the injured party every reparation; and I am ſure, in every caſe that I have ſeen, juries have always been very ready to give ample damages in caſes of defamation, wherever the reaſon of the thing ſeemed ſo to direct. I know very well, thoſe who take the other ſide of the queſtion, will urge, what are you to do with a *black-guard*,

*guard*, who is, perhaps, not worth a ſhilling? How are you to recover any damages of him who has not a farthing to pay? You will not even get your coſts of him. To be ſure, this appears, at firſt, very good reaſoning, but it is *a ſophiſtry that ought to be refuted.* Suppoſe you proſecute criminally, what damages do you get then? The fine goes to the King. And what coſts do you get? None at all: For coſts are never given to plaintiffs in criminal caſes. Conſequently, if any one man proſecute another criminally, the proſecutor is ſure to be the coſts out of pocket. But then it will be urged, the court will inflict the puniſhment of impriſonment upon him; but ſo you yourſelf may, for you may take him in execution for the damages and coſts, and keep him in jail till he pay you. But then he may pay and get free, ſay you; why then *you receive every reſtitution* that a jury of your countrymen thought proper to give you. You may aſk, perhaps, can the crown bring an action for damages? Moſt undoubtedly ſo; for it *is daily done* in the court of Exchequer, for the recovery of penalties. Therefore, if the crown can bring an action in one caſe, where is its incompatibility to bring one in another?

" True and genuine freedom can only be ſupported by poſſeſſing the liberty of ſpeaking, writing, printing or publiſhing, in the moſt free, open, and unequivocal manner.

" The *practice* of the law ſhould be rendered plain and eaſy; it ſhould be, in the emphatic language of ſcripture, ſo plain, ' *that every man who runs may read.*' Render it ſo, and you will have no occaſion for an attorney-general to file *ex officio* information.

" Nothing ſhould have induced me to have at all touched upon it, but that I think the whole buſineſs of libel perfectly an offence of civil, and *not* of *criminal* cogniſance; or at the utmoſt, if the attorney-general ſhould have the power of proceeding criminally, ' That he preſent his bill, like another man who has a proſecution to commence at the ſuit of the King, to a grand jury.' For the King is plaintiff in all criminal proceedings, though at the inſtance of a private proſecutor, who ſo prefers his bill. Why, then, I want to know, ſhould not accuſations be preſented the ſame way, where the King is plaintiff upon the information of his public officer?"

## RIGHT HON. EDMUND BURKE.

*Erectis auribus adſtant.*

THIS is another gentleman who owes his advancement to his literary talents. When the change of the miniſtry took place in the year 1765, the late William Fitzherbert, of Tiſſington, in Derbyſhire, Eſq. carried him to the Marquis of Rockingham, who made him his Secretary. This was his firſt introduction. To Mr. Fitzherbert he was known as a literary character. He had no other at that time. The firſt time he ſpoke in Parliament (being elected by Lord Rockingham's intereſt) was on the repeal of the American ſtamp act.—When he ſat down, Lord Chatham (then Mr. Pitt) roſe, and complimented him highly on his firſt ſpeech, and recommended him to purſue his happy and promiſing talent for oratory.

Lord Chatham's penetration was quickly confirmed. Mr. Burke became, in a ſhort time, the firſt ſpeaker in the Houſe of Commons.

mons. An eminent writer of the preſent age has ſaid, " he is the only man ſince the age of Cicero, who has united the talents of ſpeaking and writing with irreſiſtible force and elegance." His conſiſtency, and fidelity to his party, are proverbial. He has repeatedly rejected the higheſt and moſt flattering offers, made with a view of detaching him from his friends. Nothing could ſhake his integrity. His conduct in private life is as amiable as in public life it is reſpectable.—His character as a writer will endure as long as our language. He will be honoured by all poſterity with the title of being one of the fineſt Engliſh claſſics.

The ſervices he has done to his country are innumerable. The many laws which owe their origin to his wiſdom; which have corrected an infinite number of abuſes, of the moſt intricate and complicated nature, ſhew that he poſſeſſes the ſoundeſt judgment, the ſtrongeſt mind, and the moſt acute penetration of any man in the Houſe of Commons. Calumny and falſehood may attempt to revile and blacken ſuch a character, but all impartial perſons will deſpiſe and deteſt the fiction, the malice,

malice, and the art, by which unfounded ſlanders are produced and ſupported.

The principal attack that has been made on Mr. Burke's character, is on account of his conſtant and uniform oppoſition to all the projects which have been offered for what is called *a reformation of Parliament.* This matter is, no doubt, of great and ſerious importance to the public; and is particularly ſo at this time, not only becauſe the ſeveral gentlemen who are deſirous of reform, are ſupported in their opinions by people of great conſideration, and of great numbers, but becauſe various ſentiments of reform are extended to Ireland and Scotland.

But leaving thoſe kingdoms out of the queſtion at preſent, Mr. Burke has ſteadily oppoſed the meaſure in England, upon principle, and upon conviction of its inutility, danger, and folly; no matter by whom brought forward. On this point he has differed from Mr. Fox; and this circumſtance ſhews that he acts upon his own principles, regularly and conſiſtently.

The writer of the Jockey Club having devoted a conſiderable portion of his pamphlets, in different parts, to a ſtrong recommendation of this popular but deluſive opinion; it becomes one of the moſt eſſential parts of an anſwer, to refute theſe vague and wild chimeras.

Much has been ſaid, in an infinite number of publications, of the neceſſity of a reform of Parliament. Every argument has been urged, and every fact has been ſtated, that can give countenance and force to the requeſt.

But, as the arguments and the facts on the *other ſide* have not been given, with either the ſame activity or zeal, no reader can, in this place, deem it improper to ſtate a few of the latter, that the public may be the better enabled to judge of *both ſides* of the queſtion.—And it will from thence be ſeen whether Mr. Burke has reaſon on his ſide, or not.

Taking this argument, therefore, in its reſpective diviſions or claſſes, the firſt that preſents itſelf is that reſpecting annual Parliaments.

Thoſe

Thoſe who are for annual parliaments have ſaid, that *they* are an Engliſhman's *birth-right;* and that any parliament choſen otherwiſe than for one year only, is an illegal parliament; that the electing of a member of parliament for a longer term than one year, is a deprivation, or ſuſpenſion, of the exerciſe of the people's right of franchiſe.

The plain anſwer to theſe bold aſſertions is, that the claim to a right of annual parliaments was never made, nor was the right, as ſuch, ever exerciſed. The ſimple facts will confute every aſſertion that has been made upon this part of the ſubject.

The firſt ſummons of repreſentatives of the people was in the year 1264, the 49th of Henry III.; and conſequently this was the firſt time of *electing* them. There was no law made reſpecting the *duration* of parliament. Nor can any argument be drawn for, or againſt, the queſtion, from the cuſtom of thoſe early times; for there was no regular cuſtom.—Some years parliament ſat twice in the ſame year; and at other times there was no parliament for ſeveral years. This irregularity cauſed a ſtatute to be made, in the 4th of Ed-

ward III. for the holding of parliaments annually. It is *here* that the miſtake ſeems to have been made in the *claim* to *annual* parliaments. The claimants aſſert, that *new* parliaments were called annually in this reign, by a ſtatute which has not been repealed. And upon this aſſertion they build their hypotheſis, that the people have a *right*, by law, to elect a *new* parliament every year. But had they read the ſtatute throughout, or conſulted the ſubſequent ſtatutes of the 36th of Edward III. cap. 10. or the 2d of Richard II. nu. 28. they would have ſeen their error. Neither the 4th of Edward III. nor the two ſubſequent ſtatutes above named, authoriſe, or even mention, that a *new* parliament ſhall be elected annually.

All the three ſtatutes were made for a very different purpoſe; and that purpoſe is expreſſed in them. There can be no doubts raiſed upon the ſubject, becauſe the thing is perfectly clear; conſtruction is out of the queſtion. The purpoſe and power of thoſe ſtatutes are purely *for the redreſs of grievances*. They ſay, " That parliaments ſhall be *held* annually (not a word about *new*), and that they

ſhall not be prorogued, or *diſſolved*, until *all* the petitions and bills before them are anſwered and redreſſed." This, or rather theſe laws, are no more than obliging the King to order the parliament *to meet every year;* and this has been either wilfully, or I will ſay fooliſhly, miſtaken, and conſtrued into a ſilly meaning concerning the *election* of *annual* parliaments, although nothing can be ſo foreign to the true intent and meaning of the ſtatutes; which may be further and more clearly ſeen by the ſubſequent ſtatutes.

The parliament which met at Weſtminſter, on the 17th of September 1397, 11th of Richard II. (when all the ſtatutes above mentioned were recent in every one's memory), met again at Shrewſbury, on the 29th of January in the following year; and held its *ſecond* ſeſſion there. See Cotton's Abr. pp. 367, 371. Tyrrel, p. 964. Rymer's Fœd. tom. 8. p. 21.

The Journals of the Commons commence with the reign of Edward VI. The firſt volume opens with the *firſt* ſeſſion of the firſt parliament of that King; which laſted from

November 8, 1547, to December 23, 1547. The *ſecond* ſeſſion (expreſsly diſtinguiſhed by the word *ſecond)* from November 24, 1548, to March 14, 1548-9. The *third* ſeſſion (in like manner diſtinguiſhed by the word *third)* from November 4, 1549, to February 1, 1549-50. The *fourth* ſeſſion (in like manner diſtinguiſhed by the word *fourth)* from January 23, 1550, to April 15, 1552; when this parliament was diſſolved. See vol. i. p. 23.

The *firſt parliament* of Queen Elizabeth met on the 23d of January 1558-9, and was diſſolved on the 8th of May in the ſame year. She called no parliament until the 12th of January 1562-3, when the *firſt ſeſſion* of her *ſecond* parliament began, and continued until April 10, 1563; at which time it was prorogued to October in the ſame year; and afterwards was prorogued five more different times; ſo that the *ſecond* ſeſſion did not begin until September 30, 1566, and continued till January 2, 1566-7, when it was diſſolved. Her *third* parliament was not called until the 2d of April 1571, when it ſat only till May 29 of the ſame year, and was then diſſolved.

Her

Her *fourth* parliament ſat on the 8th of May 1572, the *firſt* ſeſſion of which laſted only till 30th of June of the ſame year. The *ſecond* ſeſſion (of this, her *fourth* parliament) did not begin until the 8th of February 1575, and continued to only March 15 of the ſame year. This parliament, ſays Sir Simon D'Ewes, page 204, was prorogued at leaſt twenty-five times. The *third* ſeſſion did not commence until January 16, 1580, and continued to March 18 of the ſame year; and after ſeventeen more prorogations, the parliament was diſſolved in April 1583.

The parliament in the reign of James I. ſat about eight days in three years, and was not diſſolved until the ninth year of his reign.

Many more proofs might be given; but theſe are enough to ſhew, that the aſſertions of former parliaments ſitting only *one* ſeſſion, and of their being diſſolved and elected annually, are not ſupported by either law or practice.

In 1641 the firſt triennial act was paſſed.—The act did not ſay that a *new* parliament ſhould

ſhould be *elected* every three years, but " that there ſhall be a *ſeſſion* held once in three years at leaſt."

In 1664 the act was repealed by the long parliament, becauſe ſome parts of it were ſuppoſed to entrench upon the prerogative. At the ſame time another law was made, ſaying, " That the ſitting and holding of parliaments ſhall *not* be intermitted above three years at the moſt."

The laſt authority I ſhall quote, upon this point, is Mr. Juſtice Blackſtone, who, in his Commentaries, ſays (after ſhewing " That no parliament can be convened by its own authority, or by the authority of any, except the King alone"), " That by the ancient ſtatutes of the realm, he (the King) is bound to convoke a parliament every year, or oftner, if need be. Not that he is, or *ever was*, obliged by theſe ſtatutes to call a *new* parliament *every year;* but only to permit *a parliament to ſit annually* for the redreſs of grievances, and diſpatch of buſineſs, if need be. Theſe laſt words are ſo looſe and vague, that ſuch of our monarchs

as

as were inclined to govern without parliaments, neglected the convoking them, ſometimes for a very conſiderable period, under pretence that there was no need of them. But to remedy this, by the ſtatute 16 Car. II. c. 1. it is enacted, that the ſitting and holding of parliaments ſhall not be intermitted above three years at the moſt. And by the ſtatute 1 W. and M. ſt. 2. c. 2. it is declared to be one of the rights of the people, that for redreſs of all grievances, and for the amending, ſtrengthening, and preſerving the laws, parliaments ought to be held frequently."

This indefinite word *frequently*, occaſioned the act, commonly called the triennial act, which paſſed in 1694; and which enacted, "That a *new* parliament ſhould be called every third year, and that the preſent parliament ſhould be diſſolved before the firſt of January 1695-6." This is the firſt law that limited the prerogative to any period of duration.

I will make but one more obſervation, which will reduce the matter to a very ſimple alternative.

If

If the freeholders and freemen have a *right* to an annual election, the King has no right to diſſolve the parliament; becauſe the diſſolution would take place at the end of the annual ſeſſion, as a thing of courſe. If the claim to ſuch *right* is juſt, the prerogative to diſſolve whenever the crown ſees fit, is an uſurpation. If the prerogative is juſt, the claim to ſuch *right* is an attempt at uſurpation.

All theſe precedents and points are clear, with reſpect to the *duration* of parliament.

Let us now proceed to the facts and arguments reſpecting the grand franchiſe, or right of election in the people. The advocates for the *reform of parliament* do not ſtop with a claim of right to *annual* parliaments; but they demand a *farther alteration;* which is, that the right of voting, or electing members of parliament, ſhall be extended to all the inhabitants of the kingdom, of whatſoever degree or condition: And ſome of theſe advocates proceed farther, and ſay, that a certain number of boroughs ſhall be disfranchiſed. It is a little parodoxical, to demand a franchiſe for thoſe who never enjoyed it, and deny the exerciſe

exercise of it in those who have supposed it to be an inheritance.

Before the reign of Henry III. there were no representatives elected by the people.—It was after the battle of Lewes, 1264, when the barons had got Henry III. in their possession, that they *began* to form a system of *representation*, and resolved to have it confirmed. The posture of affairs rendered the calling of this parliament liable to some difficulties. Indeed it was done in the King's name, who could not oppose it. But the victorious barons were not willing those of the contrary party should be summoned. These difficulties put the barons upon contriving how to make this assembly (which had hitherto consisted of only the barons and clergy) *more general*, and give it a greater air of authority.—To this end they made the King sign commissions, appointing in each county certain officers, called conservators; they were similar to sheriffs. The Earl of Leicester, who was at the head of the victorious barons, next obliged the King to sign orders to these conservators, to send up four knights in each county to sit in the ensuing parliament, as representatives

of their reſpective ſhires. In the next parliament it was altered to two knights for each county; and this number has continued ever ſince. Thus did repreſentation commence; not in the juſtice of the thing, but in the policy of the man who gave it, ſubſtituting theſe knights of the ſhire for thoſe barons whom he did not chuſe to ſummon.

The preſent Lord Camelford ſtates the matter in theſe words: "The firſt writs, in the reign of Henry III. ſummoned to parliament none but knights of the ſhire; they were conſidered as a complete repreſentation of the people. But how was their equality adjuſted? By aſſigning the ſame number of repreſentatives to the county of Rutland, as to the counties of Devon, Somerſet, Lincoln, and York. Is there ſcarcely a greater inequality to be ſtated in the preſent repreſentation? To theſe, which I have ever thought to be the true repreſentatives of the people at large, were added the great cities, and by degrees large towns, places of note, and even inconſiderable villages. By what rule they were added it is difficult to ſay; certainly not by any rule of equal repreſentation, or the uniform importance of the

the places that were honoured with this privilege. The prerogative at that time was held competent to grant ſuch privileges, as it granted the privileges of corporations and immunities as it thought expedient; and ſuch beneficial or honorary privileges have ever been held among the moſt ſacred rights that we poſſeſs. Is it fit, is it expedient, to try theſe chartered privileges at this time of day, by a *new* rule, that never did apply to them?"

Whatever was the right of election before the reign of Henry VI. is not preciſely known; but it is certain that the elections were *diſorderly* and *outrageous*, owing to *exceſſive numbers* of people. To remedy this grievance, the ſtat. of 8 Henry VI. c. 7. was made, which ſays, "That whereas knights of the ſhire had of late been choſen by outrageous and *exceſſive* numbers of people, and of *ſmall ſubſtance*, for the future, the ſaid knights ſhall be elected in every county, by people dwelling and reſident in the ſaid counties, whereof every one ſhall have in lands or tenements to the value of forty ſhillings by the year at leaſt," &c.

By the 23d of Henry VI. repreſentatives were given to the Welſh counties on the ſame principle of limitation, as to the right of voting, to prevent diſorderly and tumultuous elections by exceſſive numbers of people. And this limitation was *again* confirmed, for the ſame reaſons, 35 Henry VIII. in the act allowing knights for the county of Cheſter; which Richard II. had made a county palatine. And this limitation was *again* confirmed, a third time, by an act of the 25th of Charles II. allowing knights for Durham, another county palatine.

The caſe of Durham was attended by a circumſtance, which marks the ſenſe of parliament, upon this very point of *equal* repreſentation, in the ſtrongeſt manner. There were ſpeculators in thoſe days; but the ſound judgment of parliament rejected their reveries. When the Durham bill was engroſſed, Sir Thomas Meres (March 26, 1668) moved, "That the ſhires may have an increaſe of knights, and that ſome of the ſmall boroughs, where there were but few electors, may be taken away, and this to make part of the Durham bill." Mr. Vaughan ſaid, "If we have all

all our members here, we have no room for them. If we bring in more members, we may, by the ſame reaſon, multiply them to as many more. The county of York has many, but they may as well put in for knights of every riding." See Grey's Debates, vol. i. p. 120. But the Houſe, rather than agree to this, threw out the *whole* bill, upon a diviſion, as the leaſt evil. See Commons Journals, vol. ix. p. 69. In March 1673 the Durham bill was revived; and being now confined to the *ſingle object* of the county, it paſſed.

To theſe citations, I beg leave to add only one more; and that is, part of an addreſs from Junius, to the ſociety who called themſelves the Supporters of the Bill of Rights; occaſioned by an idea which prevailed among ſome ſpeculative people at that time (ten years ago), of disfranchiſing what they called the rotten boroughs. Junius was no friend to arbitrary monarchy, nor to arbitrary ariſtocracy, and yet he writes thus to the ſociety upon the ſubject of theſe boroughs:

" As to the cutting away the rotten boroughs, I am as much offended as any man, at

at ſeeing ſo many of them under the influence of the crown, or at the diſpoſal of private perſons; yet I own I have both doubts and apprehenſions, in regard to the remedy you propoſe. I ſhall be charged, perhaps, with an unuſual want of political intrepidity, when I honeſtly confeſs to you, that I am ſtartled at the idea of ſo extenſive an amputation. In the firſt place, I queſtion the power *de jure*, of the legiſlature, to disfranchiſe a number of boroughs upon the general ground of improving the conſtitution. There cannot be a doctrine more fatal to the liberty and property we are contending for, than that which confounds the idea of a *ſupreme* and *arbitrary* legiſlature. I need not point out to you the fatal purpoſes to which it has been, and may be, applied. If we are ſincere in the political creed we profeſs, there are many things which we ought to affirm cannot be done by Kings, Lords, and Commons. Among theſe I reckon the disfranchiſing a borough with a general view to improvement. I conſider it as equivalent to *robbing* the parties concerned of their freehold, of their birth-right. I ſay, that although this birth-right may be forfeited, or

the

the exerciſe of it ſuſpended in particular caſes, it cannot be taken away by a general law, for any real or pretended purpoſe of improving the conſtitution. *I believe there is no power in this country to make ſuch a law.* Suppoſing the attempt made, I am perſuaded you cannot mean that either King or Lords ſhould take an active part in it. A bill which only touches the repreſentation of the people, muſt originate in the Houſe of Commons, in the formation and mode of paſſing it. The excluſive right of the Commons muſt be aſſerted as ſcrupulouſly as in the caſe of a money-bill.—Now I ſhould be glad to know by what kind of reaſoning it can be proved, that there is a power veſted in the repreſentative to deſtroy his immediate conſtituent: From whence could he poſſibly derive it? A courtier, I know, will be ready enough to maintain the affirmative. The doctrine ſuits him exactly, becauſe it gives an unlimited operation to the influence of the crown. But we muſt hold a different language. It is no anſwer to me to ſay, that the bill, when it paſſes the Houſe of Commons, is the act of the majority, and not of the repreſentatives of the particular boroughs

roughs concerned. If the majority can diſfranchiſe ten boroughs, why not twenty? Why not the whole kingdom? Why ſhould not they make their own ſeats in parliament for life? For argument ſake, I will now ſuppoſe, that the expediency of the meaſure, and the power of parliament, were unqueſtionable; ſtill you will find an inſurmountable difficulty in the excluſion. When all your inſtruments of amputation are prepared—when the unhappy patient lies bound at your feet, without the poſſibility of reſiſtance, by what infallible rule will you direct the operation? when you propoſe to cut away the rotten parts, can you tell us what parts are perfectly ſound? Are there any certain limits, in fact or theory, to inform you at what point you muſt ſtop—at what point the mortification ends?—I have but one word to add—I would not give repreſentatives to thoſe great trading towns, which have none at preſent. If the merchant and the manufacturer muſt be *really* repreſented, let them become freeholders by their induſtry, and let the repreſentation of the county be increaſed. You will find the interruption of buſineſs in thoſe towns, by the riots and cabals of election, too dear a price

for the nugatory privilege of ſending members to parliament."

Theſe arguments, and theſe reaſons, are all of them ſo weighty, that I ſhall not preſume to add any thing to them, except the bare mention of a ſimple fact, of the borough of Orford being transferred to the intereſt of Lord Hertford, during the late Lord Chatham's laſt adminiſtration; which ſhews his Lordſhip's opinion of private, or family boroughs; that they were leſs dangerous in the hands of a reſpectable family, deeply intereſted in the proſperity of the country, than if they were under the influence of the crown, or open to public temptation.

A few words may be offered reſpecting the gentlemen from the Weſt and Eaſt Indies (all of whom are not plunderers): Their long reſidence abroad has precluded them from the poſſibility of making any large acquaintance at home; yet their great property, and, perhaps, thorough knowledge of the Britiſh poſſeſſions they have lived in, well entitle them to a ſeat in parliament when they come to England. If the empire is injured, they are the firſt who

are affected. Can there be either juſtice or policy in any plan which deprives parliament of the aſſiſtance of theſe gentlemen? If the boroughs are disfranchiſed, and the right of election made general, how are theſe gentlemen to come into parliament? Will the voters of any locality elect a ſtranger, in preference to a gentleman well known in the neighbourhood? When the intereſts of Jamaica or Bengal are under conſideration, can the gentleman who has never been out of England, ſupport or oppoſe a commercial regulation, ſo ably or properly as the gentleman who has lived there?

There is an argument made uſe of by the reformers, in favour of a general right of election, which, on the firſt reading, ſeems a little plauſible. They ſay, that if the right of election were general, that is, in all the inhabitants, there would be leſs corruption; becauſe it is *impoſſible* for any candidate to bribe *all* the people. They are here ſpeaking of cities and large towns, in which the inhabitants amount to ſeveral thouſands. Admitting the impoſſibility to the fulleſt extent, and admitting likewiſe, for a moment, all the ſpeculations

lations founded thereupon, let us try theſe arguments by facts. Weſtminſter is the place where the right of election comes neareſt to the propoſition of all perſons having a right to vote. Every houſekeeper there has a right to vote for members of parliament; and if there are two, or more, partners (even ten or a ſcore) in the ſame houſe, they have *all* a right to vote for the *ſame premiſes*. This is pretty general. Now all thoſe gentlemen who know any thing of a conteſted election in Weſtminſter, muſt know that it is one of the moſt expenſive elections in England; and the reaſon that the elections in Weſtminſter are not oftener conteſted, is the juſt dread of the enormity of the expence.

There never was a *general right* of election. The firſt idea of parliament was by a *ſelection*. The original barons were no more than a *ſelection*. The firſt writs for counties were directed to a *ſelection*; then to particular cities and towns: What was that but a *ſelection*? A *general* right was never ſuppoſed to exiſt, from the firſt day of repreſentation to the preſent hour.

If we admit that any innovation ought to be made in the preſent parliamentary conſtitution, the firſt perſons who would claim, and unqueſtionably would have a good claim, would be the *national* proprietors of the public funds, and the members of the monied companies, the Bank, Eaſt-India, &c. Theſe poſſeſſing a ſpecies of property which was unknown to our anceſtors, at the time that repreſentation was given, have, as ſuch, never been repreſented. Their weight and conſequence, at this time, entitle them to the firſt conſideration; yet they have never been known to complain. They are too wiſe not to know, that innovations in the conſtitution would hazard the permanency, the ſecurity, and the happineſs of it.

MR.

## MR. PITT.

*No friend to faction, nor no dupe to zeal,*
*Foe to all party but the public weal.*

P. WHITEHEAD.

MR. PITT has ſhewn himſelf both an able miniſter, and a man of the world; that is, a man who knows and underſtands mankind. When he found the majority of Lord North's parliament againſt him, he did not reſign, like his predeceſſor Lord Lanſdowne: He had ſeen the folly of that meaſure of his Lordſhip, and he profited by it.

The conduct of the Coalition, in their oppoſition to Mr. Pitt, rendered them obnoxious to the nation. He took immediate advantage of that tide in the opinions of men, which at that moment flowed ſtrong in his favour. He had a ſufficient knowledge of human nature to ſee its force; and of penetration to diſcover the uſe that might be derived from it. He choſe the happy moment to diſſolve the

the parliament. Many leading characters in the oppoſition to him, loſt their elections becauſe they had oppoſed him. He came with an hereditary claim to the public ſuffrage, from the weight and dignity of his father's character. Lord Lanſdowne, who firſt introduced him into office, had not ſuch an advantage. It is undoubtedly true, that Mr. Pitt's friends made the moſt of this circumſtance in his favour. But it is equally true, that Mr. Pitt, in early life, made the moſt of every opportunity to improve himſelf. He viſited moſt parts of England and Scotland. He took pains to deſerve the public favour: And that he has obtained it is notoriouſly true. And it is alſo equally true, that his character, both private and public, moſt amply teſtifies to the preſent age, and will to the future, that his fame ſhall wear well, for it has been virtuouſly earned.

His conduct, ſince he became miniſter, has been arraigned, like that of every other miniſter; with the ſame ſort of temper, and with the ſame ſort of argument; the ſame ſpecies of envy, and the ſame degree of enmity. But the envy and the argument have pro-

proceeded, *pari paſſu*, without eſtabliſhing any one poſition to give them remembrance—to give a twinkling exiſtence to the dying embers of their languid flame.

In a word, Mr. Pitt is the only miniſter, ſince his father, who has extinguiſhed party and ſecret influence; who has united the court and people; who has directed the ſceptre of the crown, and wielded the ſhield of democracy; who has commanded where others have ſupplicated; who has maintained his authority at St. James's, and his credit with the nation; who, never having betrayed the confidence of the firſt, nor ſacrificed the intereſt of the laſt, is more than reſpected in the cloſet, and more than admired by his country.

END OF PART I.

Nov. 17, 1

*This Day is Published, Price ONE SHILLING,*

No. IX.

(Continued Monthly), of

THE

# POLITICAL STATE

OF

# EUROPE,

FOR THE YEAR M,DCC,XCII.

CONTAINING

AN AUTHENTIC AND IMPARTIAL STATEMENT

OF

EVERY MILITARY OPERATION

OF THE PRESENT BELLIGERENT POWERS,

AND

A CORRECT COPY OF EVERY STATE PAPER, DECLARATION, MANIFESTO, &c.

ALSO

A CORRECT TRANSLATION

OF THE

DEBATES AND PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY AND CONVENTION OF FRANCE.

---

☞ The Public will be pleased to observe, that this is the only Periodical Publication that is entirely devoted to these interesting objects.

*** On account of the great increase of interesting events, and of important State Papers, in the present crisis of affairs, Number X. which will complete the First Volume, and will contain a copious Index, will be published on Saturday the 1st of December.

†‡† Gentlemen, Merchants, and others, who are in the habit of sending New Books to their Friends and Correspondents in the Country, or Abroad, will find this Work to contain a more full and accurate Statement of the Affairs of Europe, at this interesting moment, than any other Publication whatever.

---

LONDON:

Printed for J. S. JORDAN, No. 166, *Fleet Street:*

And Sold by all other Bookfellers in Town and Country; of whom complete Sets may be had.